



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,383	04/25/2001	Martin Weston	87805-9021	7197
75	7590 05/03/2004		EXAMINER	
Derek C Stettner Michael Best & Friedrich 100 East Wisconsin Avenue Milwaukee, WI 53202-4108			PHILIPPE, GIMS S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
			DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/830,383	WESTON, MARTIN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Gims S Philippe	2613				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) do  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will,  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NTION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may ⇒ation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) M by statute, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on .					
,						
3) Since this application is in condition for	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-13 and 17-28 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) 20-28 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1,2,6,7,17 and 18 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 3-5,8-13 and 19 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objectio		• • •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	,					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. △ Certified copies of the priority does	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in the priority documents have be Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1)   Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4\ ☐ Intervie	w Summary (PTO-413)				
<ul> <li>Notice of References Cited (* 10-032)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.6.</li> </ul>	-948) Paper N	No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2613



#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This is a first action in response to application no. 09/830,383 filed on April 25<sup>th</sup> 2001 in which claims 1-13 and 17-28 are presented for examination.

## Specification

1. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

## Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or

REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a).

- "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

Art Unit: 2613

(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

#### **ABSTRACT**

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37
 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 2613

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2, 5-7, and 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boie (US Patent no. 5,444,493).

Regarding claim 1, Boie discloses a method of analysis motion between adjacent fields of interlaced video signal, comprising the steps of vertically interpolating one of both of the fields to produce respective signals for the two fields which corresponds to vertical position (See Boie col. 1, lines 47-66, col. lines 33-43), subtracting the signals to provide a field difference signal (See Boie col. 2, lines 10-20), and removing a component in the field difference which arises from vertical detail (See Boie col. 4, lines 23-31). The applicant should note that the gradient will generate the difference signal.

Regarding claim 6, Boie discloses a method of creating a field difference signal by subtracting video signals from different fields (See Boie col. 2, lines 9-20, col. 6, lines 10-17) characterized in that one or both of the fields are vertically interpolated prior to subtraction by taking weighted sums of lines from within the same field so as to obtain signals corresponding to similar vertical positions (See Boie col. 1, lines 47-66, col. 3, lines 23-42). The applicant should note that the gradient will generate the difference signal.

Art Unit: 2613

As per claim 17, all of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above

rejection of claim 1. In addition, filtering is required to perform

As per claim 18, Boie further provides the field difference for the current and succeeding

Page 5

fields (See Boie col. 1, lines 50-56).

As per claim 7, Boie discloses correcting by taking measure of the vertical detail from

one or both of the fields (See Boie col. 4, lines 23-30).

As per claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above

rejection of claim 1. In addition, Boie discloses correcting by taking measure of the

vertical detail from one or both of the fields (See Boie col. 4, lines 23-30).

As per claim 5, Boie further provides the field difference for the current and succeeding

fields (See Boie col. 1, lines 50-56).

5. Claims 3-5, 8-13, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 20-28 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2613

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art fails to teach or suggest a video filtering process creating an output by taking the weighted sum of contributions over a filter aperture... and utilizing each field difference to select a filter aperture. The prior art further fails to teach or suggest comparing a preceding field difference signal with a succeeding field difference signal and changing a selection to film mode if the field difference signal are significantly different, and changing the selection to video mode if both signals are similar but not small.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sezan et al. (US Patent no. 5473383) teaches mechanism for controllably deinterlacing sequential lines of video data field based upon pixel signal associated with three successive interlaced video fields.

Woodham (US Patent no. 5608464) teaches digital video effect generator.

Thomas (US Patent no. 6233018) teaches video signal processing.

Wang et al. (US Patent no. 6266092) teaches method and apparatus for video line multiplication with enhanced sharpness.

Weston (US Patent no. 4789896) teaches interpolating lines of video signals.

Art Unit: 2613

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gims S Philippe whose telephone number is (703) 305-1107. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-7:00) Second Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris S Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gims S Philippe Primary Examiner Art Unit 2613

**GSP** 

April 29, 2004